

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 28, 2003

LB 622

misstated this originally. But there's a reason why cities would want this money in particular, and the reason is this. The MEF money normally, you know it's coming, and therefore you have to budget it, and it's a restricted fund. And a restricted fund means that it's in your budget and it's subject to the budget lid. But the money over and above the projected MEF equalization distribution comes as a budgetary surprise. Because it's a budgetary surprise, it is a cash balance, and it is subject to being spent. And I think Senator Mines and I would agree this money is unrestricted. That means it's outside the lid, and it's not subject to the lid, but it gives the city greater flexibility. It allows them to do things, you know, provide for a service, pay for something that would be extraordinary. But it's not money that was projected and inside the lid. It's unrestricted and, therefore, flexible. And it suits a city's needs greatly, because it is flexible and it's outside the lid. But as a state Legislature who passed the lid, let us scratch our heads for a moment. Did we pass the lid, but then also design or countenance the creation of state programs that would be outside the lid and therefore flexible, unrestricted, and in fact able to be spent without that limitation of the lid? I got to tell you that I think the public policy, from our perspective, is monies that we give and monies that are spent are under the lid, generally speaking. That's where we're supposed to be. And the argument for this money in particular is, gosh, this money is unrestricted, and is really helpful and flexible, is true, but that's true of any dollar that's unrestricted. And unfortunately, that's in direct conflict with our public policy, which is create a lid, put a maximum on city spending. As unpleasant and as uncomfortable as that is, that's what we've done. And the money that Senator Mines and Senator Janssen want is money outside the lid. It is for that very reason that it has a particular value to the cities, because it gives them greater flexibility than money otherwise. And it's true, it's much more flexible than money if we increase an aid program. Because if we increase an aid program, it's going to be under the lid, and the only thing they can do with that money is reduce property taxes. That's the only thing they can do. Ask yourself this: What's the public policy of this Legislature? Why are we giving monies to local political subdivisions? Is it to fund local services, or is it